

REMARKS**Amendment to Claim 19**

Applicant has amended claim 19 to correct a minor informality (deleting a duplicate recitation of "storing each of"). The amendment has not narrowed the scope of claim 19, because the meaning of original claim 9 was apparent despite the informality.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 10-14, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,206 to Sebastian et al. (hereinafter Sebastian).

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131. Moreover, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection does not satisfy these requirements.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

a product idea interface for capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object; and
a design alternative interface for capturing a plurality of design alternatives for said product in a plurality of respective design alternative objects.

Claim 10 recites, in part:

capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object; and
capturing a plurality of design alternatives for said product in as plurality of respective design alternative objects.

Claim 18 recites:

a computer readable storage medium tangibly embodying program instructions implementing a method for capturing information related to product innovation-related data, the method comprising the steps of:
capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object; and

capturing a plurality of design alternatives for said product in a plurality of respective design alternative objects.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sebastian does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1, 10, and 18. For example, Sebastian does not disclose “design alternative objects.” A design alternative object is a data structure that encapsulates information representing a possible solution or design for an idea encapsulated in a product idea object. *See* application, page 7, lines 32-34. Accordingly, each design alternative object represents one discrete solution or design that addresses the defined product idea in a unique manner from the other design alternative objects.

Sebastian discloses a design application that integrates the design of products that are manufactured using injection modeling processes. *See* col. 5, lines 11-21 and col. 19, lines 32-35 of Sebastian. In the portion of Sebastian relied upon by the Examiner, Sebastian discloses that “utilizing all available forms of information..., the present invention works to produce, concurrently, detailed part geometry, as well as preliminary tool design and processing recommendations.” Col. 5, lines 22-25 of Sebastian. The detailed part geometry refers to information that models the physical dimensions of the product. The preliminary tool design refers to the characteristics of the mold used to create the product. The processing recommendations refer to the characteristics of the injection molding process (e.g., the flow rate, temperature, etc.). Each of these items are not design “alternatives.” Each of the items disclosed in Sebastian are merely different characteristics of the same design.

Accordingly, Sebastian does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1, 10, and 18. Claims 2-6, 11-14, and 20 respectively depend from base claims 1, 10, and 18 and, hence, inherit all limitations of their base claim. Therefore, claims 1-6, 10-14, 18, and 20 are not anticipated.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7-9, 15-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,974 to Malaugh et al. (hereinafter Malaugh).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant submits that the rejection does not satisfy these criteria.

Claims 7-9, 15-17, and 19 respectively depend from base claims 1, 10, and 18 and, hence, inherit all limitations of their base claim.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

- a product idea interface for capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object; and
- a design alternative interface for capturing a plurality of design alternatives for said product in a plurality of respective design alternative objects.

Claim 10 recites, in part:

- capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object; and
- capturing a plurality of design alternatives for said product in as plurality of respective design alternative objects.

Claim 18 recites:

- a computer readable storage medium tangibly embodying program instructions implementing a method for capturing information related to product innovation-related data, the method comprising the steps of:
 - capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object; and
 - capturing a plurality of design alternatives for said product in a plurality of respective design alternative objects.

For the reasons previously discussed in regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Sebastian does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the base claims claims 1, 10, and 18. For example, Sebastian does not teach or suggest design alternative objects.

Moreover, Malaugh does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in the base claims. The system disclosed in Malaugh operates with ordinary CAD applications. Specifically, the system in Malaugh receives “generic” CAD function calls and translates the generic function calls into a form appropriate for a specific CAD platform. *See* Summary of the Invention of Malaugh. Accordingly, Malaugh does not teach or suggest design alternative objects.

Thus, the applied references (either alone or in combination) do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1, 10, and 18. Claims 7-9, 15-17, and 19 respectively depend from base claims 1, 10, and 18 and, hence, inherit all limitations of their base claim. Therefore, the applied references do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 7-9, 15-17, and 19.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 21-25. The new claims are supported by, inter alia, pages 7-10 of the original application. No new matter has been entered.

Claim 21 recites, in part:

- a product idea object encapsulating information related to a conception of a product being designed according to said product design process;
- product requirement objects encapsulating requirements to be fulfilled by said product;
- design alternative objects encapsulating multiple designs that represent a solution corresponding to said product idea object; and
- a requirement fulfillment interface for facilitating queries related to levels of fulfillment of requirements encapsulated in said product requirement objects by alternative designs encapsulated in said design alternative objects.

As previously discussed, the applied references do not teach or suggest design alternative objects. Moreover, the applied references do not teach or suggest a requirement fulfillment interface for facilitating queries related to levels of fulfillment of requirements encapsulated in said product requirement objects by alternative designs encapsulated in said design alternative objects.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable over the applied references. Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21 and inherit all limitations of claim 21. Claims 22-25 are submitted to be patentable over the applied references.

Conclusion


Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and request the Examiner to pass the application to issue.

If any fee or fee amount is due that is not addressed in any paper in this submission, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10003656-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV482736740US in an envelope addressed to: MS Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: June 8, 2004

Typed Name: Carrie Wilson

Signature: 

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Christopher S.L. Crawford

Reg. No.: 51,586

Date: June 8, 2004

Telephone No. (214) 855-8378